

Attorney Docket No.: CING-131  
Appl. Ser. No.: 10/773,555

PATENT

**REMARKS**

Applicant submits that the present amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated July 14, 2006 and, thus, the application is in condition for allowance.

By this reply, claims 1, 9, 16 and 21 are amended. Claims 1-23 remain pending. Of these, claims 1, 9 and 16 are independent. An expedited review and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Actions, claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for lack of antecedent basis. Without necessarily agreeing with the assertion, claim 21 has been amended to remove the offensive “the” to expedite the prosecution of this application. The rejection should therefore be withdrawn.

In the outstanding Office Actions, claims 16-20 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failure to comply with a cited provision. It is asserted that the recited claims do not produce a tangible result. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The claims as filed do produce a tangible result, which result has value. The steps involved include comparing and modifying information, two important real world steps in authenticating an approved user, prior to allowance of access or relaying of content. See, for example, Figure 6. These steps are not abstract and are used in authentication of a user prior to relaying of content. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Actions, claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fuh (USPN 6,609,154). It is asserted that the Fuh recites various elements in his patent that anticipate the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Attorney Docket No.: CING-131  
Appl. Ser. No.: 10/773,555

PATENT

Fuh does not anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in the pending claims because Fuh does not use a known pattern of information. Such pattern may be random and only known to the server. Thus, it cannot be easily guessed or copied. Fuh discloses IP addresses as authentication information. However, such IP addresses are set and may easily be copied and shared between users. In contrast, the present invention as recited in the pending claims allows a higher level of authentication and control by having a string or series of strings of identifiers to distinguish one user from another. Thus, Fuh cannot anticipate or obviate the present invention as recited in the pending claims, and thus the rejection should be withdrawn.

In the outstanding Office Actions, claims 1, 2, 5, 7-17, 20, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhigang (US Pub. No. US2005/0014489). It is asserted that the Zhigang recites various elements in his patent that anticipate the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Zhigang also fails to anticipate and obviate the present invention as recited in the pending claims for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to Fuh. In fact, the same deficiencies exist for Zhigang as did for Fuh. Thus, for the reasons set forth above, Zhigang cannot anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Thus, the rejections should be withdrawn and the applications allowed to proceed to issue.

In the outstanding Office Actions, claims 3, 4, 6, 18, 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhigang in view of Fuh. It is asserted that the Zhigang teaches substantially the same invention as recited in the pending claims but for an HTTP proxy. It is then asserted that Fuh does teach this deficiency and thus the combination would render the present invention as obvious. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Attorney Docket No.: CING-131  
Appl. Ser. No.: 10/773,555

PATENT

Neither Zhigang nor Fuh, nor any other art of record, anticipate or obviate the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Each reference lacks the fundamental teaching of the present invention, as recited in the pending claims. Thus, their combination, even if any motivation existed outside of Applicant's own disclosure, still lacks the teaching to obviate the present invention as recited in the pending claims. So for the reasons set forth in the discussion above, the rejections should be withdrawn and the application allowed to issue.

A TWO (2) month extension of time is hereby requested to enter this amendment. PTO-2038 form is included with an authorization to charge the one-month extension fee to a credit card. If any other fees are associated with the entering and consideration of this amendment, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account 50-2882.

Applicant respectfully requests an interview with the Examiner to present more evidence of the unique attributes of the present invention in person. As all of the outstanding rejections have been traversed and all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If the undersigned attorney can assist in any matters regarding examination of this application, Examiner is encouraged to call at the number listed below.

Dec 14 06 11:55p

Fariborz Moazzam

703-542-7508

p.10

Attorney Docket No.: CING-131  
Appl. Ser. No.: 10/773,555

PATENT

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 14 December 2006

  
Fariborz Moazzam  
Reg. No. 53,339  
Cust. No. 39,013

MOAZZAM & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
7601 Lewisville Road, Suite 304  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 442-9481 (direct)  
(703) 991-5978 (fax)